



From the Boston Commonwealth.
SENSATIONS.

BY THE LYNN BARD.

'Tis a noble thing—is it not?—when men,
Who boast of their might and knowledge,
Of the wealth they have gained, by sword and pen,
And their morals in church and college!
Descend to enslave poor honest folks,
Whom they should be proud of cherishing;
Then flout their scorn, and crack their jokes,
When the helpless and poor are perishing!

They have placed their foot upon human hearts!
They have steeped the earth in sorrow!
They will glory awhile in their damning arts,
But O, remember the morrow!
Is God with us, or is God with them?
The God who scorns the oppressor!
Will not time their acts of wrong condemn,
When awakens the great Redeemer?

Go, talk to the pirate of Midway sea,
When the merchant vessel founders—
Go, talk to the shark of the deep, when he sees
The helpless sprats and flounders—
You may have some hope of a clam-shell boat,
When it strikes on a midwave boulder;
But no mercy expect from a Webster or Choate,
When he preys on the dark slaveholder!

They have landed together in villany,
In their cold and scornful manner;
Read their daring scrolls of blasphemy,
Inscribed on every banner!
'Ye shall not talk of the rights of man!
'Ye shall have no agitation!'—
'We will silence the lip, and still the pen,
In this great and mighty nation!'

'We will stop your mouths and suppress your songs!'
'We will have no free consulting
Upon human rights or inhuman wrongs!'
Thus come their words insulting—
'Ye shall not dare, as your fathers dared,
To awaken from thralldom's slumbers,
When the strong right arm of truth was bared,
To free earth from all that encumbers!'

'Ye may not tear, in the cause of right,
The prey from my hungry ravens!
For though ye have in your power the might,
Ye're a set of dastard cravens!

We hold in our hands the government
And are fools enough to give us!
And we'll make it still, to our hearts' content
For the good of those who outlive us!'

And thus their boasting in scorn is flung
In the face of earth and heaven!
While the blood from Slavery's heart is wrung,
And souls to oppression given!
But the day has dawned, and is rising fast,—
Fit the theme for minstrel's story,—
When oppression's reign shall to hell be cast,
And earth be redeemed in its glory!

Then grant, good God, who approve prayer,
And hatest all wrong and oppression,
Be thou with those who their breasts would bare,
To free earth from all aggression!
Be thou with those who would be with thee,
Every mind from its bonds unchaining,
Who would follow the footsteps of Liberty,
Until right over might is reigning!

'MY FATHER AND MOTHER ARE COMING TO-DAY.'

BY MRS. FRANCES D. GAGE.

'My Father and Mother are coming to-day,—
Thrilling and beautiful words are they;
Do they not make you leap for joy?
Do you not feel you're again a boy,
With your curly head on your mother's breast,
As she soothes you to your evening rest?
Don't you see the butterfly on the wing,
Don't you hear that same wild robin sing?
Are you not again by the homestead hearth,
Cracking your nuts and your jokes of mirth?
Brothers and sisters, are not all there,
Playing hide and seek round the old arm-chair?
Hark! it is fancy, or do you hear
The cheerful hum of your mother dear,
As she pines her needle and to and fro,
Darning the worn-out heel or toe?
And 'Don't, dear, don't,'—so loving and mild,
Comes its notes again to the wayward child?

'My Father and Mother are coming to-day'—
Thrilling and beautiful words are they;
Do they not make your manhood dream
Like a half-sleeping, shadowy dream,
Taking you back to the days of youth,
Listening to Father's words of truth,
When hurrying away from native land,
With trunk well strapped and hat in hand,
Pating the floor with a restless toe,
As words of counsel come strong and slow,
Bidding, with tremulous voice, Beware,
The paths of vice and the tempter's snare?
And you almost feel that farewell tear
Chased away by a smile at the 'old man's fear';
But many a lesson you've learned, I ken,
That ye dreamed not of in your youth-pride then.

'Father and Mother are coming to-day'—
Would that I these thrilling words could say!
My Father and Mother will come no more,
To visit their child as in days of yore;
Side by side they have slumbered for many a year,
I think of them oft with a filial tear,
But voice ever whispers, 'Oh! weep not thus!'—
In the spirit land they are waiting now,
Go, do thy duty with cheerful heart,
That when from life's loves thou'rt called to part,
Thy soul in triumph may calmly say—
'I'm going to Father and Mother to-day.'

CHEERFULNESS.

BY ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.

I think we are too ready with complaint
In this fair world of God's. Had we no hope
Indeed beyond the zenith and the scope
Of gray blank sky, we might be fain
To muse upon eternity's constraint
Round our aspirant souls. But since the scope
Must widen early, is it well to drop
For a few days consumed in loss and taint?
O! pusillanimous heart, be comforted;
And, like a cheerful traveller, take the road,
Singing beside the hedge. What if the bread
Be bitter in thin inn, and thou unshod
To meet the flint? At least it may be said,
'Because the way is short, I thank thee, God!'

NOVEMBER.

Sullen by fits, unloved of all the year,
Forlorn November glooms upon the world,
Wraps his chill feet among the leaflets e'er,
And hails aloft the banner'd clouds unfurled!
No more the sun, with Mida's power supreme,
Holds a proud court o'er Autumn's yellow vale—
Denuded lands now crave each scanty grain,
Hush'd are the rills, and hush'd the nightingales,
Dumb, as in fear, the old earth's tuneful bands—
Dead the sweet flowers!—and dying, day by day,
Glad Nature's smile! Like Niole she stands,
Her warm life ebbing in a mist of sighs,
Her tears congealing in her rueful eye,
Her garments blanched, and in her heart deasy!

The Liberator.

PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

JOS. BARKER IN REPLY TO E. WILSON.
[CONCLUDED.]

E. W.—Your class of men has not yet produced many martyrs.

J. B.—More than yours, I imagine. All the martyrs in the world came from the advocates of unpopular doctrines, the opponents of old errors, the reformers of institutions and manners. It is foolish to talk of men being martyrs for popular opinions. Our class of men are always martyrs. They are martyrs now. They are persecuted all their life through. At times, they are even imprisoned and put to death; and in all cases, they are hated, despised and slandered. A man who could get ten thousand dollars a year for joining your class of men, gets only frowns, black looks and calumny for uniting with our class.

E. W.—It would be a poor thing to be a martyr for they know not what.

J. B.—It would.

E. W.—No promise on which they can rely; no support but the vagaries of their own imagination.

J. B.—Still we are martyrs. What kind of men must we be!—for how great and godlike must we be, without a promise to cheer us, or a miracle to strengthen us, we can still have the hate, the wrath, the abuse, and the violence of our opponents! You will not find such virtue in all the sectarian Israel. But all our views you call 'vagaries of our own imaginations.' I answer, 1. People can suffer and die for the vagaries of their imaginations as well as for great truths. Both Christians and anti-Christians have died for vagaries of their imaginations. 2. I suppose it would be as easy for you to call our opinions bad names, as it is for you to call ours bad names, provided we found ourselves unable to refute them, or could persuade ourselves that bad names were good and honest arguments.

E. W.—The great Magyar has not discovered that the Bible is an obstacle in the way of annihilating European tyranny.

J. B.—Where is your proof? You cannot tell what the great Magyar thinks from what he says, as you yourself have had good means of knowing. Besides, the great Magyar is as fallible as most other people. I could give you the names of men as likely to know, and as likely to speak what they think, as the great Magyar, who say that the Bible is an obstacle to the annihilation of European tyranny.

E. W.—You represent Cromwell, Hampden, Milton, &c., as condemned by Scripture for resisting their rulers.

J. B.—I do; and the representation is true. For the Scripture says, 'Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.' Rom. 13:2.

E. W.—Why, those men considered the Bible the palladium of their liberty; and that it taught the equality of the human family.

J. B.—That does not alter the case. The Bible is both for liberty and slavery, for equality and inequality, for resistance to tyrants and for non-resistance, for obedience to magistrates and for disobedience, for truth and for falsehood, for private judgment, and for submission and obedience to church rulers. It is difficult to say what it is not for. You have not proved that the Bible is not for fornication and adultery, when you have merely proved that it is for purity or celibacy; nor have you proved that it is not in favor of lying, when you have only proved that it is in favor of truth. It abounds in contradictions and inconsistencies.

E. W.—In Cromwell's army, religion was exceedingly popular.

J. B.—One form of it. But religion has a thousand forms; and some of those forms suit rebels, and some suit tyrants. Some suit men of peace, and some suit men of war. Cromwell had one form; Charles had another, and Cromwell's army had a number more. Charles's form of religion made Charles denounce Cromwell as a rebel against God and his anointed; Cromwell's made him denounce Charles as a traitor; while some of the religions of the army made several of the soldiers denounce both of them as oppressors of God's people. Charles killed the rebels, the rebels killed Charles, and Cromwell killed the levelers; and all had the Bible on their side. One part justified Charles; another Cromwell, and another the levelers, and other parts justified a hundred other forms of religion and policy.

E. W.—Cromwell expounded the Scriptures to his troops.

J. B.—And Charles expounded them to his son, and his Bishops expounded them to Charles, and the levelers expounded them to each other, and the fifth monarchy men to their comrades, and the Quakers to them; and they all found encouragement in them to pursue their respective courses.

E. W.—Kossuth professes to be a firm believer in the Bible.

J. B.—And he gave unqualified praise to American statesmen and American institutions, though he knew of the existence of slavery. Either, therefore, he believed slavery to be good and scriptural, or told lies. In either case, his word is not good for much.

E. W.—The observance of this rule—'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them,' would banish all oppression from the world.

J. B.—And the observance of these rules—'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers,' 'Obey magistrates,' 'Obey every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake,' 'Obey them that have the rule over you,' would make oppression universal and eternal.

E. W.—Christianity ever sympathizes with the oppressed and down-trodden, and gives oppressors no quarter.

J. B.—It depends on what you call Christianity. Some things called Christianity—some things taught in the New Testament, are in favor of the tyrants, the plunderers and the destroyers of men, require the oppressed and plundered not to resist them,—charge those who resist them with resisting God, and threaten them with damnation,—and even go so far as to utter the gross, the palpable, the barfaced and insolent falsehoods, that 'rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil';—do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same.' Rom. 13:1-7.

E. W.—People who wish to play the tyrant always wish to exclude the Bible from their victims.

J. B.—Yet, at the same time, they quote it to justify their tyranny. The tyrant knows that some portions of the Bible teach resistance to tyrants, and that the oppressed might stumble on those portions, and therefore he wishes to keep the Bible in his own hands. But tyrants generally hire men to preach other parts of the Bible to their subjects and slaves, to keep them abject, submissive and obedient.

E. W.—It would be impossible to make a Bible to please the different schools of anti-Bible Divines.

J. B.—And as impossible either to make or to find one to please the different schools of pro-Bible Divines. Of making Bibles, and translating and re-translating Bibles, there has been no end; yet the different schools of pro-Bible Divines are as far from being pleased with any of them as ever. We have King James's translation, John Wesley's, Dr. Booth's, Dr. Conquest's, Mr. Webster's, Dr. Watson's, A. Clarke's, J. Taylor's, Mr. Sharp's, Mr. Bell's, or the New Version, A. Campbell's, and numbers more; yet the different schools of Bibliolatrious divines are quite at odds respecting their merits. They cannot even agree as to which Greek New Testament or Hebrew Old Testament is best. Nor can they agree as to the merits of the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts from which the Bibles are made or compiled. And what is of equal importance, they cannot

agree as to the meaning of any of the Bibles. They differ endlessly both as to what God has spoken, and as to what God means by what they suppose him to have spoken. And none of them have any thing which they can give you as God's word, but their own imperfect and fallible ideas of what they conceive to be the meaning of certain doubtful translations, or of certain doubtful readings of certain doubtful and discordant Greek and Hebrew books or manuscripts.

E. W.—You charge Jesus Christ with teaching or approving gross immoralities.

J. B.—Will you never cease to charge me falsely? With my words in print before you, and with eyes to see and a mind to understand, and with my faithful though tender rebukes in the *Bugle* in your mind, will you still persist in believing me? Will God thank you for such conduct?

E. W.—Your intention, in charging Christ with considering lying, treason, highway robbery, fornication, adultery, thieving and murder to be lawful.

J. B.—Well; you have done your worst now, unless a Bible-believing woman's worst is worse than I am able to conceive. You little know how you tempt me to speak harshly in return. You do not even seem to consider how harshly truth would warrant me in speaking. I can hardly refrain from quoting certain passages of Scripture which your conduct brings to my mind. But I will try to resist the temptation a little longer. No one can try a man's patience like a certain class of women, but I must try to endure to the end. Instead of indulging my resentment, I will turn aside to your readers and say, 'Ladies and Gentlemen: the thought that Jesus taught or approved gross immoralities, never entered my mind. It is impossible, therefore, that it can ever have fallen from my lips or my pen.' I look on Jesus as one of the most beautiful of men. I feel towards him a love indescribable. That he was free from error or moral imperfection, I do not believe. An absolutely perfect man may be dreamed of and talked of, but not seen. But to charge him with teaching or approving gross immoralities could hardly enter the mind of a man, whether sane or insane.

E. W.—It is discouraging to see the discrepancy in the opinions of anti-Bible men.

J. B.—And is it not discouraging to see the discrepancy in the opinions of pro-Bible men? Do you know how many sects there are among the believers in the divine authority of the Bible? Do you know on how many points these sects differ from each other? Do you know how important the points on which they differ? Do you know how widely the priests and members of each sect differ among themselves? Do you know how they quarrel, and baffle each other, and excommunicate, curse, and damn each other? Do you know how seriously they differ about the number of books there ought to be in the Bible, and the claims of the different translations, interpretations, manuscripts, and various readings of each different book? Why, it would take a book a hundred times as big as the Bible to give only a bare catalogue of the differences of opinion among believers in the divine authority of the Bible. I do not know a point, either great or small, either referring to God or man,—to truth or duty,—to the past, the present or the future, on which believers in the Bible do not differ.

E. W.—H. C. Wright, D. Foster and J. Barker have all different ideas of God.

J. B.—And so have all the men and women on earth, Elizabeth Wilson and her husband not excepted. And, more than that, every man on earth is continually changing his own ideas of God from childhood to old age, in proportion as his understanding and affections unfold themselves. As God has not, in his universe, two trees, two flowers, or even two leaves, exactly alike, so neither has he two children, in all his countless offspring, that carry in their hearts exactly the same idea or mental image of him.

E. W.—What would please your God, would not please H. C. Wright's.

J. B.—And what would please yours, would not please your neighbor's or your fellow Christians.

E. W.—Bible men do differ in opinion, but not radically and essentially.

J. B.—Then there are no radical or essential differences. For there is not a subject on which they do not differ, and on which they do not differ widely. They differ about God. One says God is a man, another that he is a spirit. One that he foreknew all things; another, that he cannot foreknow men's voluntary actions. One says God is three persons; another, that he is but one; and another, that he is no person at all. One says God visits the iniquities of fathers on their children, even dooming all mankind to labor and death for the sin of one; another says that he will not allow the son to bear the iniquity of the father, or the father to bear the iniquity of the son. One tells you that Jesus is God; another, that he is simply a man; another, that he is both. One says God died; another says it is impossible. One says little children are born utterly depraved, and under God's wrath and curse, and justly liable to damnation; another, that they are born pure as angels, under God's smile and blessing, and that of such the kingdom of heaven. One believes that the wicked will all be destroyed; another, that they will live for ever in fire and brimstone; and another, that the wicked and the righteous will all be saved. And so onward without end. I could myself give you a thousand points, all deemed radical and essential by certain Bible-believers themselves, on which Bible-believers differ. But we have said enough on this head. But if the points on which Bible men differ are not radical and essential, why do they expel each other for their differences, and even doom each other to eternal damnation for them?

E. W.—Anti-Bible men's standards of duty are antagonistic.

J. B.—And pro-Bible men's rules of duty are antagonistic. One thinks he may eat all things; another eateth only herbs. Some think it wrong to eat blood, or even flesh, eggs, butter or cheese; while others think it right to eat all these things. One thinks it right to hang murderers, and kill their natural enemies; another believes it wrong to resist evil. One thinks it wrong to swear; another thinks it right. One thinks it wrong to own houses and land; another thinks it wrong to be without them when he can get them. One thinks it wrong to lay up for himself treasure on earth; another thinks he is worse than an infidel who neglects to do so. One thinks a community of property binding on Christians; another thinks it best for each one to hold and administer his own. One thinks it right to hold slaves; another thinks it the sum of all villainies. One thinks it right to resist tyrannical rulers; another thinks that he that resisteth the ruling power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and shall receive to himself damnation. One thinks it right to drink wine and strong drink; another thinks it a sin to do so. One thinks it right to dance, to fiddle, to sing songs of love and humor, to play at cards, chess, draughts, dominoes, backgammon, cribbage, nine-pins, cricket, bowls, to hunt and sport, to attend theatres and balls, to mix with the world, to hold fellowship with unbelievers, to marry men and women of the world; while others believe all these things to be wrong, and even damnable. Some think it wrong to laugh, while others think laughing good both for the body and the soul. Some think it wrong to work on the Sunday; others think it as proper to work on Sunday as on Monday. And so in a thousand things. In truth, every consistent Bible-believer's standard is his own idea of what the Bible enjoins; and every Bible-believer's idea of what the Bible enjoins is different from the idea of every other Bible-believer.

E. W.—All Bible men believe in the same God and in the same attributes.

J. B.—Every one acquainted with the creeds of the different sects of Bible men knows better. The Swe-

denborgians believe that God is a man, with body, parts, and affections; others regard this as a heresy. The God of the Calvinist and the God of the Universalist are quite different beings. The God of the Orthodox Trinitarian and of the heterodox Unitarian are as different. The Bible itself presents a variety of Gods before us, some of them eating and drinking, walking and talking, and dwelling in temples made with hands, and others of them as Elting heaven and earth, and having need of nothing. One it represents as a partial God, another as a universal Father. One as a man of war; another as a God of peace. One it represents as talking to a man at one time, face to face; at another, refusing to show any thing but his hinder parts; another it speaks of whom no man has seen or can see. One it represents as hating one man and loving another, even before they were born, or had done either good or evil; another it represents as good to all, and speaks of his tender mercies as over all his works. One it represents as directing one part of mankind to exterminate other parts of mankind; another it represents as urging all his children to live in peace. The Bible presents about as many different views of God, or to use your own form of speech, presents about as many different Gods to our view, as the writings or traditions of the Pagans.

E. W.—What good ideas of God have you which the Bible does not present?

J. B.—I cannot say. But what foolish or false, what childish or horrible, what black or blasphemous, what low or grovelling, what cruel or revolting idea of God did ever enter mortal entertain, for which you may not find a match in the Bible?

E. W.—If people were left without any final arbiter in which they could place confidence,—if they were left to set according to the dictates of their own understandings, the suggestions of their own affections, instincts and consciences, they would soon have as many gods, with different attributes, as are represented in the heathen mythology, and they would have no settled moral standard.

J. B.—Yet this is exactly the state in which God has seen fit to leave nineteen-twentieths of his children. This is the state in which he left all his children for many generations. God cannot have the same horror of such a state as you have, or he would have provided against it. He seems to think that the understandings, effusions, instincts and consciences which he has given men are sufficient for them, if rightly used. God appears to consider that his creatures have his law written on their hearts, or woven into their nature. Either the Bible cannot be so necessary for men as you imagine, or God must be exceedingly wanting in attention to his children's welfare. Perhaps God is not so much troubled at differences of opinion among men, as some of his anxious children are. Besides, God must have been sadly disappointed with respect to the effects of the Bible, if he expected it to bring all men to think alike about himself and his will; for if it has not increased men's differences of opinion, it has certainly not lessened them much, if it has lessened them at all. In our opinion, it has increased men's differences of opinion, and in millions of cases, secured and embittered their tempers too. You talk as if you had got a FINAL ARBITER, in which you can place confidence; and a settled moral standard. Will you tell us where you have found them? Is it in the common English translation, made by false and perjured ecclesiastics; a work with which every sect in Europe and America finds fault? Is it in John Wesley's translation, the chief part of which even the Methodists, his followers, have allowed to go out of print? Is it in no; it cannot be in any translation, for all translations are the work of erring men; and you might as well rely on your own understanding, as on the understanding of men as liable to err as yourself. Is it in the Greek and Hebrew Bibles that you find your final arbiter and settled moral standard? But even these are the work of men, and differ seriously among themselves. For there are several Greek and Hebrew Bibles, compiled from various manuscripts, all differing from each other, and all of them imperfect. It cannot be here. Besides, how few can read Greek and Hebrew! Not one in a hundred. And fewer still can understand them thoroughly. In truth, no man living can understand them thoroughly. The opinions of scholars about the meaning of Greek and Hebrew words and phrases in the Bible are endless. And they have no final arbiter in which they can place confidence, nor any settled literary standard. They have Greek and Hebrew dictionaries, but these differ from each other, and they are all the work of weak and erring, and in some cases of perjured and perjured men. You gave us, in one of your years, the vulgar illustration respecting the Frenchman's flea, which the man put his finger on it, was not there. If ever that illustration fitted a case, it is the case of your final arbiter and settled moral standard. You put your finger on it a dozen times, and it is not there once. Or, rather, to leave your illustration to yourself, and to return to matters of simple fact, you have no such thing as a final arbiter, or settled moral standard. The Catholics may talk of a final arbiter with some appearance of truth; but Protestants cannot. Even their talk about the Bible, as if it were some fixed and definite book, is not to be justified. There is no such book recognised by all Bibliolatries as the Bible. The Bible is not one, but many; nor is it the same, but endlessly various. And if Bible people were honest and intelligent, they would, instead of talking about the Bible, begin to talk about some particular Bible, as the 'Breches Bible,' 'King James's Bible,' 'Coverdale's Bible,' 'Wesley's Bible,' 'the French Bible,' 'the Catholic Bible,' 'the Protestant Bible,' or 'the Vulgate,' or 'Septuagint,' or some particular edition of the Vulgate or Septuagint; or some particular Greek and Hebrew Bible. For these are all called Bibles, yet they are all widely different from each other. Besides, as your final arbiter and your settled moral standard would, after all, be only a Greek and Hebrew book, and as the Greek and Hebrew of this would have to be interpreted by men's own understanding, your Bible-believers would still have nothing but their own understandings, instincts, affections and consciences to rely on. And it is a fact, that Bible-believers differ as widely in translating and interpreting their Bibles, as non-believers in the Bible do in framing opinions about God and duty, without special regard to the Bible.

E. W.—We cannot know the essential character of God, but as he reveals himself.

J. B.—True; but if God does not reveal himself by his works, how does he reveal himself? To me it seems that, as a tree may be known by its fruit, and a man by his deeds, so God may be known by his works.

E. W.—All is uncertainty and doubt, respecting the moral attributes of God, without revelation.

J. B.—And if God should leave revelation to a Greek and Hebrew book, all would still be uncertainty and doubt, unless we had, first, infallible translators and interpreters of the book, and, secondly, infallible understandings to take in and apply their translations and interpretations.

E. W.—The manifest tendency of infidelity is to render unstable the foundation of true religion and good morals, and to introduce universal skepticism.

J. B.—What is the tendency of decrying human reason, human intellects, human affections, human conscience,—and representing men as having no guide to truth and duty, no ground of certainty, but an old, unchangeable, Greek and Hebrew book, known to but a very small portion of mankind, many parts of which are unintelligible, and about the meaning of nearly every other part of which there are, and are likely ever to be, innumerable different opinions? The worst unbelievers are those who cannot or will not 'believe God when speaking in themselves, through their own understandings, affections, instincts and consciences, or when speaking in his works at large; and the greatest infidels are those who are unfaithful to their own

nature. All who go out of themselves, to seek the rule of their faith and conduct in old books, are infidels. Besides, men of sense and virtue, even if they believe the Bible to be divine, often take care not to believe or obey a single sentence of it, till they have so far modified it by translation, consultation of various readings, and private interpretation, as to bring it into harmony with what their own understandings, instincts, affections and consciences assure them is right.

E. W.—We do most affectionately—

J. B.—You should say, angrily, bitterly, and contemptuously.

E. W.—Admonish—

J. B.—You should say, abuse, misrepresent, and slander.

E. W.—We do most affectionately admonish you, Joseph Barker, to beware of what you are doing—re-

frain from waging war against the Bible, lest haply you be found to fight against God.

J. B.—We admonish you, Elizabeth Wilson, to beware of what you are doing, in charging God with being the author of a book that so fearfully blasphemes him, and in representing him as leaving nineteen-twentieths of his children without the means of knowing his character and his will, or of understanding their duty, their interests and their destiny. If you think yourself prepared to answer to God for what you are doing, you may depend upon it I consider myself prepared to answer to him for what I am doing. I am doing to God as I would wish God to do to me, if I were God, and he were Joseph Barker. I would not treat God as you treat him, nor would I treat his children as you treat some of them, for all the world.

E. W.—If the Bible had been of men, it would have come to naught long ago; it could not have withstood the investigation of the enlightened ages through which it has passed.

J. B.—I suppose the Turk would say the same of the Koran, the Parsee of the Zend, and the Hindoo of his Vedas and Shasters. They have withstood the investigation of ages more or less enlightened, and none of them have come to naught. They will live as long as the Bible, I suppose, and the Bible will probably live as long as time endures. But neither the one nor the other will always be regarded, as they all are now regarded by vast multitudes, as of divine authority. The books may remain, but the foolish notions respecting their supernatural origin and superhuman authority will pass away. They are passing away. Men of sense and honesty, when they examine into the grounds of those notions, invariably give them up. What you miscellaneously increasing every where, more rapidly than ever. And the more believers in the Bible come to, as you have done, to defend their notions, the more rapidly still will it increase. Universal discussion of the notions you hold will be their downfall. Neither man nor woman can uphold them. The doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible will follow the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, and all who love the truth will rejoice in their fate.

E. W.—You cannot defeat the Anti-Slavery cause. J. B.—I shall not try. I shall do my best to aid it. I have aided it heretofore, and I hope to aid it everywhere.

E. W.—It is of God, and will ultimately prevail. J. B.—So I believe. The story about God or Nonh cursing Canaan, and dooming him or his offspring to be servants of servants through all coming ages, I regard as a fable. And the prophecy recorded in Isaiah 14:1, 2, to the effect that the house of Israel should possess the strangers for servants and handmaids, in the land of the Lord, I regard as an evil dream that shall never be fulfilled.

E. W.—That your principles will have a tendency, in some measure, to retard the Anti-Slavery cause, there is no doubt.

J. B.—O yes, there are many doubts. Many think my principles will ever further the cause.

E. W.—Your principles and position will have a tendency to divest the American Anti-Slavery Society of some of the laurels it has so deservedly won.

J. B.—I hope not. I am not an agent of the Society, and the Society has always allowed men with such views as mine to work with it. And the Society has not had much of a reputation for orthodoxy for many years. Most of its orthodox supporters in Great Britain and Ireland left it before I left England. Very few people in Europe have helped the cause for some time past, except such as you call Infidels. And it is much the same in America. My advocacy, therefore, of the Anti-Slavery cause, cannot harm it much.

E. W.—No man has ever got any honor to himself, or to any association to which he may have belonged, by assailing the Scriptures.

J. B.—There are some who do not seek the honor that cometh of men. There are some who think it happier to have all manner of evil spoken of them, falsely, than to purchase all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, by unfaithfulness to truth. Still, I could mention a man, who has got honor, both to himself and a large association, by assailing portions of the Scriptures, and even by setting aside the whole, as of divine authority. I refer to one Jesus of Nazareth. If the New Testament story be true, Jesus assailed portions of Scripture in his very first sermon on record, and at length set the whole entirely aside as a rule of life or an authoritative law. Yet who has gained more honor, either to himself, or to the association with which his name has been joined?

E. W.—Indeed, no infidel writer, to whom we have had access, is deserving of honor. They have never investigated the question with candor and honesty, but have resorted to misrepresentation of the Bible, and perverted its meaning, and given people reason to say, that it is either ignorance of the Bible, or malice, or a desire to show superior wisdom and independence of thought and expression, and not the love of truth, which instigates their attack.

J. B.—It is too late, madam, to talk in that way. People will judge for themselves which party shows most signs of candor and honesty; and love of truth, and which is most chargeable with misrepresentation, malice, ignorance and pride. They will see which writer keeps closest to his argument, and which is most prone to deal in rude, unmanly personalities, discreditable insinuations, contemptuous sneers, and threats of God's displeasure. Thaw will see which justifies his views of the Scriptures by honest quotations from them, and who, instead of dealing with those quotations, runs away from the question, and hides himself behind the great names of Newton, Locke and Milton. They will judge both our tempers and our arguments, and their judgment will be just. Charges of ignorance, malice and pride, of hatred of God, hatred of virtue, and hatred of truth; with solemn admonitions, pious horrors, ostentatious prayers, and threats of heavenly vengeance, would have had more force some years ago, than they can have just now. The times have changed. I am much mistaken, if one whom you call infidel, I mean your countryman, Theodore Parker, does not obtain, from competent judges, more credit for honesty and love of truth, and a better name for learning and knowledge, than all the advocates of Bible infallibility in Europe or America. Already he is regarded by numbers in Europe as one of the greatest of men, and as one of the ablest of writers. There are not wanting those, even among the more thoughtful and literary, who place him first, and revere him as their highest specimen of humanity. The greatest and best of men are reading his works with admiration and rapture, and rejoicing that so godlike a man has appeared to instruct and elevate their race. Yet you can see nothing in such a man but a hateful infidel, worthy of God's wrath.

E. W.—Your objections to the Bible have been re-

futed over and over again.

J. B.—I have never had the happiness to meet with any of these refutations. Perhaps, if I did, I am inclined to believe, that if you had really given me any refutations of my objections, you would have given me a few of them in your own letters.

In conclusion: I belong to no society that makes belief in the divine authority of any Bible a condition of membership. Your charge of inconsistency, therefore, falls to the ground. As to all 'holy communications' and all 'truths of divine revelation,' I receive as a divine revelation, nor do I regard all the commandments as holy. If the American Anti-Slavery Society is built on the doctrine